

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/616,303	<b>Applicant(s)</b> HANSEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dan Washburn	<b>Art Unit</b> 2628	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** allowed

 (1) Dan Washburn.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

 (2) Dmitria Bunkin.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 16 March 2007
**Time:** 10 a.m.
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*101 rejection of claims 1-15*

Claims discussed:

*claims 1, 8, and 23*

Prior art documents discussed:

*none*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



ULKA CHAUHAN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner Washburn contacted Attorney Bunkin and proposed cancelling claims 1-15 in order to put the case in allowable form. Claims 1-15 are drawn to a method with no tangible result, thus, they are non-statutory under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being drawn to an abstract idea with no tangible result. Attorney Bunkin contacted her client and the client agreed to cancelling claims 1-15 in order to put the case in allowable form. Attorney Bunkin also proposed amending system claim 23 so that it better represents the method disclosed in cancelled method claim 8. Examiner Washburn agreed to writing up an examiner's amendment to amend claim 23 in order to describe, "a functional unit configured to perform computations using the first catenated data to produce the second catenated data."